

REMARKS

A petition pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.136(a) and the fee required by 37 CFR § 1.17(a)(3) are submitted herewith. The due date for response to the Official Action mailed June 5, 2000 is now December 5, 2000.

Applicant's undersigned attorney wishes to thank Examiner Laufer for the courtesies extended in the course of their interview on August 30, 2000. The Interview Summary (Paper No. 17) prepared by the Examiner at the interview is accurate.

At the interview proposed amendments to the independent claims (claims 1, 6, 10, 14, 126 and 27) for overcoming the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 112. As now presented, the claims make clear that the secret key information is received from an external device and is stored in the information input device. In view of this, it is submitted that the claims now comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Also, at the interview the invention was discussed with the Examiner and the differences between the invention and the prior art were pointed out. As stated at the interview, this invention permits any of several people who use an input

device (e.g. a camera, a video or audio input device, a word processor, etc.), to add to the information which is output from the device, the personal signature of the person using the device so that the source of the information can be authenticated and the person who receives the information can be sure that it came from a particular person.

The device described in the Friedman publication is a camera in which a private key is stored. The purpose of this is to impress the identification of the camera on the information which is output from the camera. However, the person who receives this information does not know the identity of the person who has used the camera and therefore cannot be sure of the authenticity of the information.

The device described in the Davies patent (U.S. Patent No. 4,799,258) is a device which uses a token (10) which is carried by an individual and which permits the individual to gain access to various functions or capabilities of a computer. The token 10 does contain a secret code, but it does not output this code. Instead the token contains a microcomputer which encodes a request by the user who wants access to the computer. What goes to the computer is a message which has the digital signature of the user. As pointed out in Column 5, lines 25-27

of Davies, the secret key of the user never leaves the token.

Further, in the present invention, the external device contains only a secret key. It does not carry out any microprocessor or microcomputer function, such as required by the token 10 shown in Fig. 1 of Davies, et al. Consequently, in the present invention, the construction of the external device can be of a very simple construction.

The claims have also been carefully amended in order to express the distinctions of this invention over the prior art more clearly. Specifically, the claims now all specify that the secret key information is the secret key of a person using the information input device; and the claims also now specify the means for or step of outputting the first information containing the digital signature. Also, the claims contain a whereby clause which makes clear that the output information is provided with the digital signature of the person who uses the information input device.

It is submitted that, in view of the amendments presented herein, all of the claims now patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable.

Further consideration by the Examiner and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


William J. Brunet
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 20,452

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 108061 v 2